

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-13 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, and 13 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated October 28, 2008, Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-13 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

### **I. Interview Summary**

Applicants thank Examiner Godbold for the courtesy of a telephone interview on December 4, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the claims as currently amended overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The Examiner further indicated that while the claims as amended overcome the cited references, further searching would be necessary. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

### **II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Final Office Action dated October 28, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0039996 ("*Flam*") in view of "The Bidirectional Algorithm" ("*Davis*") in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0135358 ("*Lissauer*"). Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the reason that it recites, "determining a first strong character in the plurality of characters, in response to determining that the first strong character is not in the plurality of characters: determining whether a last character in the plurality of characters has been considered, in response to determining that the last character in the plurality of characters has not been considered, locating a next character in the plurality of characters, and determining whether the next character is the first strong character, in response to determining that the next character is not the first strong alphabetic character, returning to determining whether the last character in the plurality of characters has been considered, in response to determining that the next character is the first strong character, determining the reading order based on the next character, and in response to determining the reading order based on the next character, setting the reading order of the sentence of the mixed language text message to be the reading order of the first sentence of the mixed language text message." Amended Claims 7 and 13 each include a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least at page 12, line 1-23.

In contrast, *Flam* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Flam* discloses that a mouse may be used to select a "switch" button in a window that reverses an order of Hebrew letters. (See page 5, paragraph. [0062].) In *Flam*, Latin characters in the window are not reversed. (See page 5, paragraph. [0062].) Further, the Examiner stated that *Flam* does not disclose evaluating successively, by a computer system, a plurality of characters comprising a mixed language text message to determine whether ones of a plurality of characters

comprise one of the following: a strong character and a weak character. (See Final Office Action, page 4, lines 22-24.) Consequently, *Flam* could not disclose: i) a determination whether one of a plurality of characters comprise a strong character and a weak character; ii) determining a first strong character in a sentence; and iii) determining whether a last character in the sentence has been considered. Rather, *Flam* merely discloses selecting a button to reverse an order of text.

Further, *Davis* does not overcome *Flam*'s deficiencies. *Davis* merely discloses that bidirectional characters types are values assigned to each Unicode character. (See *Davis*, page 9 of 30.) In *Davis*, a strong bidirectional character type "L" comprises a Left-to-Right mark (LRM), most alphabetic, syllabic, Han ideographic characters, digits that are neither European nor Arabic, and all unassigned characters except in the ranges (0590-05FF, FB1D-FB4F) and (0600-07BF, FB50-FDFF, FE70-FEFF). (See *Davis*, page 11 of 30.) Like *Flam*, nowhere does *Davis* disclose: i) a determination whether one of a plurality of characters comprise a strong character and a weak character; ii) determining a first strong character in a sentence; and iii) determining whether a last character in the sentence has been considered. Rather, *Davis* merely discloses that bidirectional characters types are values assigned to each Unicode character.

Furthermore, *Lissauer* does not overcome *Davis*' and *Flam*'s deficiencies. *Lissauer* merely discloses that when Chinese text is entered, the text is stored in a database in Unicode format. (See page 3, paragraph [0045].) An export operation, in *Lissauer* converts the text into Windows® code page 950, commonly referred to as Big5 according to *Lissauer*. (See page 3, paragraph [0045].) Once the text is converted in

*Lissauer*, the text may be displayed on any client personal computer with Chinese Windows® (according to *Lissauer*), as long as a browser used supports Big5 encoding. (See page 3, paragraph [0045].) Like *Davis* and *Flam*, nowhere does *Lissauer* disclose:

- i) a determination whether one of a plurality of characters comprise a strong character and a weak character; ii) determining a first strong character in a sentence; and iii) determining whether a last character in the sentence has been considered. Rather, *Lissauer* merely discloses that in order to display Chinese text, Chinese Windows® (according to *Lissauer*) may be used if it is supported by Big5 encoding.

Combining *Flam* with *Davis* and *Lissauer* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Flam*, *Davis* and *Lissauer*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "determining a first strong character in the plurality of characters, in response to determining that the first strong character is not in the plurality of characters: determining whether a last character in the plurality of characters has been considered, in response to determining that the last character in the plurality of characters has not been considered, locating a next character in the plurality of characters, and determining whether the next character is the first strong character, in response to determining that the next character is not the first strong alphabetic character, returning to determining whether the last character in the plurality of characters has been considered, in response to determining that the next character is the first strong character, determining the reading order based on the next character, and in response to determining the reading order based on the next character, setting the reading order of the sentence of the mixed language text message to be the reading order of the first sentence of the mixed language text message," as recited by amended

Claim 1. Claims 7 and 13 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 7, and 13 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 7, and 13.

Dependent Claims 5-6 and 11-12 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 7, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 5-6 and 11-12.

### III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of

this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

Date: December 29, 2008

By: /D. Kent Stier/  
D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:ak

